



ATTORNEY GENERAL OF TEXAS  
GREG ABBOTT

October 28, 2003

Mr. Steven D. Monté  
Assistant City Attorney  
Callas Police Department  
1400 South Lamar Street, #300A  
Dallas, Texas 75215-1801

OR2003-7737

Dear Mr. Monté:

You ask whether certain information is subject to required public disclosure under chapter 552 of the Government Code. Your request was assigned ID# 190137.

The City of Dallas (the "city") received a request for five categories of materials related to the collection and creation of materials for inclusion in an intelligence database and the creation, maintenance, and operation of such a database focused on materials related to protests, meetings, and public activities of certain individuals and organizations. You claim that a portion of the requested information is excepted from disclosure under section 552.108 of the Government Code.<sup>1</sup> We have considered the exception you claim and reviewed the submitted representative sample of information.<sup>2</sup>

Section 552.108(b) of the Government Code excepts from disclosure "[a]n internal record or notation of a law enforcement agency or prosecutor that is maintained for internal use in matters relating to law enforcement or prosecution . . . if: (1) release of the internal record or notation would interfere with law enforcement or prosecution[.]" Gov't Code § 552.108(b)(1). Section 552.108(b)(1) is intended to protect "information which, if released, would permit private citizens to anticipate weaknesses in a police department, avoid detection, jeopardize officer safety, and generally undermine police efforts to effectuate the

---

<sup>1</sup>To the extent it exists, you state that all other requested information will be released to the requestor.

<sup>2</sup>We assume that the "representative sample" of records submitted to this office is truly representative of the requested records as a whole. See Open Records Decision Nos. 499 (1988), 497 (1988). Here, we do not address any other requested records to the extent that those records contain substantially different types of information than that submitted to this office.

laws of this State.” *City of Ft. Worth v. Cornyn*, 86 S.W.3d 320 (Tex. App.—Austin 2002, no writ). This office has stated that under the statutory predecessor to section 552.108(b), a governmental body may withhold information that would reveal law enforcement techniques. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 (1989) (release of detailed use of force guidelines would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 456 (1987) (release of forms containing information regarding location of off-duty police officers in advance would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 413 (1984) (release of sketch showing security measures to be used at next execution would unduly interfere with law enforcement), 409 (1984) (if information regarding certain burglaries exhibits pattern that reveals investigative techniques, information is excepted under section 552.108), 341 (1982) (release of certain information from Department of Public Safety would unduly interfere with law enforcement because release would hamper departmental efforts to detect forgeries of drivers’ licenses), 252 (1980) (section 552.108 is designed to protect investigative techniques and procedures used in law enforcement), 143 (1976) (disclosure of specific operations or specialized equipment directly related to investigation or detection of crime may be excepted).

However, in order for a governmental body to claim this exception to disclosure, it must meet its burden of explaining how and why release of the requested information would interfere with law enforcement and crime prevention. *See* Open Records Decision No. 562 at 10 (1990). Furthermore, generally known policies and techniques may not be withheld under section 552.108. *See, e.g.*, Open Records Decision Nos. 531 at 2-3 (1989) (Penal Code provisions, common law rules, and constitutional limitations on use of force are not protected under section 552.108), 252 at 3 (1980) (governmental body did not meet burden because it did not indicate why investigative procedures and techniques requested were different from those commonly known). Whether disclosure of particular records will interfere with law enforcement or prosecution must be decided on a case-by-case basis. *See* Attorney General Opinion MW-381 (1981).

You assert that the release of the submitted information would interfere with law enforcement. You state that

[t]he responsive material is maintained to develop strategic and tactical intelligence data relating to such individuals and organizations involving possible criminal activity. The criminal intelligence files are developed to: (1) identify crime problems and persons involved in criminal activities; analyze criminal information in order to provide operational units of the Department and other law enforcement agencies with necessary data to investigate criminal activity; (2) obtain investigative leads; (3) locate evidence or wanted individuals; (4) and identify perpetrators and eliminate suspects in unsolved offenses.

Further, you explain that “[a]lthough a criminal intelligence file may be opened in connection with a specific criminal investigation, the file is not closed once an arrest is made and the case is prosecuted, because the underlying criminal enterprise may still exist.” You also state that “[i]nvestigations of members may continue and be used to develop additional leads on suspected criminal activity.” Finally, you assert that

[t]he release of this information could hinder any open criminal investigations reflected in the files, as well as the ongoing intelligence gathering process. Disclosure would inform the individuals named in the documents that their activities are under investigation by law enforcement. This would allow these individuals to change their methods of operation to make it more difficult and more dangerous for law enforcement to gather the information necessary to successfully arrest and prosecute these individuals.

Based upon your arguments and our review of the submitted information, we find that the city has adequately demonstrated that the release of the submitted information would interfere with law enforcement or crime prevention. *See* Gov’t Code § 552.108(b)(1); *see also* Open Records Decision No. 508 at 4 (1988) (governmental body must demonstrate how release of particular information at issue would interfere with law enforcement efforts unless information does so on its face). Accordingly, we conclude that the city may withhold the submitted information pursuant to section 552.108(b)(1) of the Government Code.

This letter ruling is limited to the particular records at issue in this request and limited to the facts as presented to us; therefore, this ruling must not be relied upon as a previous determination regarding any other records or any other circumstances.

This ruling triggers important deadlines regarding the rights and responsibilities of the governmental body and of the requestor. For example, governmental bodies are prohibited from asking the attorney general to reconsider this ruling. Gov’t Code § 552.301(f). If the governmental body wants to challenge this ruling, the governmental body must appeal by filing suit in Travis County within 30 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.324(b). In order to get the full benefit of such an appeal, the governmental body must file suit within 10 calendar days. *Id.* § 552.353(b)(3), (c). If the governmental body does not appeal this ruling and the governmental body does not comply with it, then both the requestor and the attorney general have the right to file suit against the governmental body to enforce this ruling. *Id.* § 552.321(a).

If this ruling requires the governmental body to release all or part of the requested information, the governmental body is responsible for taking the next step. Based on the statute, the attorney general expects that, within 10 calendar days of this ruling, the governmental body will do one of the following three things: 1) release the public records; 2) notify the requestor of the exact day, time, and place that copies of the records will be provided or that the records can be inspected; or 3) notify the requestor of the

governmental body's intent to challenge this letter ruling in court. If the governmental body fails to do one of these three things within 10 calendar days of this ruling, then the requestor should report that failure to the attorney general's Open Government Hotline, toll free, at (877) 673-6839. The requestor may also file a complaint with the district or county attorney. *Id.* § 552.3215(e).

If this ruling requires or permits the governmental body to withhold all or some of the requested information, the requestor can appeal that decision by suing the governmental body. *Id.* § 552.321(a); *Texas Dep't of Pub. Safety v. Gilbreath*, 842 S.W.2d 408, 411 (Tex. App.—Austin 1992, no writ).

Please remember that under the Act the release of information triggers certain procedures for costs and charges to the requestor. If records are released in compliance with this ruling, be sure that all charges for the information are at or below the legal amounts. Questions or complaints about over-charging must be directed to Hadassah Schloss at the Texas Building and Procurement Commission at (512) 475-2497.

If the governmental body, the requestor, or any other person has questions or comments about this ruling, they may contact our office. We note that a third party may challenge this ruling by filing suit seeking to withhold information from a requestor. Gov't Code § 552.325. Although there is no statutory deadline for contacting us, the attorney general prefers to receive any comments within 10 calendar days of the date of this ruling.

Sincerely,



W. Montgomery Meitler  
Assistant Attorney General  
Open Records Division

WMM/lmt

Ref: ID# 190137

Enc: Submitted documents

c: Ms. Annette M. Lamoreaux  
East Texas Regional Director  
American Civil Liberties Union  
P.O. Box 132047  
Houston, Texas 77019-2047  
(w/o enclosures)